

VOL. XXIX.....N<sup>o</sup>. 8,748.

## WASHINGTON.

APPOINTMENT OF EIGHTEEN QUAKERS TO BE INDIAN AGENTS—GEN. STEADMAN STILL AT NEW ORLEANS—INTERESTING DEBATE IN THE SENATE ON THE APPOINTMENTS—SENATOR SPRAGUE PREPARING ANOTHER SPEECH—FURTHER REDUCTIONS TO BE MADE IN THE CLERICAL FORCE OF THE DEPARTMENT.

WASHINGTON, Wednesday, April 21, 1869.  
The list of nominations sent to the Senate to-day contained the names of eighteen members of the Society of Friends, or Quakers, to be Indian Agents. They were recommended for the positions by the various Quaker organizations in Pennsylvania and other States. It is not expected that they will depart for their new field of labor until Gen. Parker, the new Commissioner of Indian Affairs, assumes control of his bureau, which will occur on the 1st proximo.

The statement published that Gen. Steadman had landed in Cuba with a party of men, to join with the insurgent in the pending revolution, is evidently not true. A number of gentlemen who have just arrived here from New Orleans, say they left Steadman there, and when they departed he had not the remotest idea of leaving for Cuba. They say further that they neither saw nor heard of any expedition being fitted out in that city for the Spanish Island. Admiral Hoff telegraphs the Navy Department that he has had several of his vessels cruising in search of the supposed expeditions, but so far has been unable to discover any. The demand made by our Government for the surrender of the condemned American brig Mary Lowell will be submitted to the Home Government at Madrid before an answer can be given, hence an immediate reply is not looked for.

The Senate remained in open session to-day for nearly two hours, during which time a spily and most interesting debate sprang up in regard to the appointments to office. The discussion arose on a resolution offered by Senator Carpenter, requesting the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, Treasury, Interior, the Postmaster-General, and the Attorney-General, to furnish the Senate with the names and ages of all the clerks and employees of their offices, the compensation received, the States from which they are appointed, how long they have resided in such States, and upon whose recommendation they had been appointed. Mr. Carpenter supported the resolution, and advocated the reduction of the present force in the Departments, and the payment of better wages to a smaller number. He complained that there was no fair proportion of these offices to the States, and thought the thing should be remedied. His remarks stirred up a number of the Senators, who were evidently anxious to embrace the opportunity to show their dissatisfaction at the appointments that have been recently made. Mr. Sherman seemed satisfied, and was opposed to the resolutions. He had got all he wanted, and felt that it was about time that Senators stopped going to the Departments to beg and solicit the petty offices in the gift of the Secretaries. Mr. Trumbull was filled with scorn and shame that Senators should be compelled to do such things. Mr. Abbott and others of the Southern Senators thought the opportunity a good one for them to enter a complaint that their section of the country was not fairly represented in the various Departments, and an amendment to Mr. Carpenter's resolution was offered, providing for an equal distribution among the States, in proportion to the population. Mr. Fessenden could not see the justice of the claims made by Southerners for the reason that before the war the South monopolized all these appointments. Mr. Cameron was in favor of the resolution. He said that a few days ago the President had nominated a person from Pennsylvania for a foreign mission, and the Senators from that State had hard work to convince the Committee that he was not a suitable man for the position, when it was well known that the person nominated was an habitual drunkard. In another instance a man was nominated from that State for a consular position who was a constitutional thief, although he had the recommendation of the Union League, of which he was a member. Senators should be more independent, and not recommend everyone. He admitted that nine-tenths of the appointments in his State were of his friends, because the President could not select from the party without getting his (the speaker's) friends. The debate would have been continued during the whole day evidently, had not a motion for an Executive session been made and prevailed. Mr. Sumner's resolution to extend the time of adjournment came up to-morrow as the final business. The contracts for carrying the mails throughout the New-England States and New-York, for which proposals were opened some time since, have been awarded by the Post-Office Department. These contracts were for stage and horse service alone, no railroad transportation being included in the bids. About 850 routes were awarded in the New-England States, and 400 in New-York. The prices ranged about 25 per cent higher than has been paid for similar service during the past four years.

The Senate sat in Executive session until 4:30 p. m., and then took a recess till 7:30 p. m., adjourning finally at 10 o'clock. Before the recess, some time was consumed on the San Juan Treaty, its friends trying to push it to vote. It was finally postponed till to-morrow. About 30 nominations were then confirmed. When that of Mr. Sanford, nominated Minister to Spain, was reached, Messrs. Buckingham and Cameron opened up a fierce attack on him, denouncing the nomination as one most unfit to be made. They charged that Mr. Sanford was no Republican, or, if he was, he had that happy faculty of suiting any party that might be in power. Messrs. Sumner and Anthony came to the defense of Mr. Sanford, and replied to the attack of his opponents. In the heat of the debate the motion for a recess prevailed. It was expected that the discussion on Mr. Sanford's name would be continued in the evening session, but when the Senate assembled it was determined to act only on those cases where there was little or no objection to the nominees. After about 150 nominations had been confirmed the Senate adjourned.

Senator Sprague went to the Senate chamber to-day prepared to make another of his late series of speeches, but was headed off, and prevented from getting the floor by some of his brighter and sharper fellow-members. Senator Nye has been threatening a speech in reply to Sprague's last, but has been unable to secure the floor for that purpose. He will make a final effort to-morrow.

A list of about 130 persons, whose services will be dispensed with about the first of May, has been prepared at the Interior Department, which comprises clerks in the Patent, Pension, and Land Offices. John Jay, the new Minister to Austria, received his instructions from the State Department to-day. He will sail on the 6th of May.

Wm. A. Howard, the new Minister to China, will receive his instructions in a few days. In view of the present relations between the two countries, it is thought his instructions will be important to the commercial interests of the United States under the treaty negotiated by U. S. Chinese Embassy last summer. Mr. Howard will go to China by way of Europe, and will confer with Mr. Burlingame before presenting his credentials.

Two colored men have been appointed to clerkships in the Third Auditor's office, one of whom is a son of Frederick Douglass, and the other James E. O. Hare of North Carolina, formerly a clerk in the State Legislature.

Secretary Boutwell, to-day, sent to the President for his signature a large number of commissions of revenue officers, who have recently been confirmed by the Senate, and they will shortly enter upon the discharge of their duties.

The Controller of the Currency has issued a circular requiring every National Bank to furnish the

Treasury Department with a statement of its condition on the 15th April.

About twenty Northern gentlemen and capitalists, including some Members of Congress, will leave this city to-morrow for an extended Southern tour, for the purpose of informing themselves of the present condition of the Southern States and the prospects for business the coming season. The party will visit the States of Virginia, North and South Carolina, Alabama, Georgia, and Louisiana, and may extend their trip to Texas.

A meeting, composed mostly of colored people, to express sympathy for the Cuban revolutionists, was held to-night in the Fifth-street Colored Presbyterian Church. Addresses were delivered by the Rev. Zella Martin, Mr. Gonzales (a Cuban), Dr. Charles Purvis, Prof. Geo. B. Vashon, Prof. Wilson, and Chas. H. Peters, all but Mr. Gonzales being colored. The meeting was not large, but was composed of the more intelligent class of the colored people of Washington, including a number of females, and the addresses were listened to with marked attention. At the close of the meeting a collection was taken up for the Cubans, netting \$50 above expenses. Gen. Butler returned to-night from Baltimore, where he has been conducting the suit brought against him by Kimberly & Co. He was closeted with Secretary Fish to-night.

NO EXCHANGES OF SECURITIES IN NATIONAL BANK DEPOSITS—FIVE NEW VELOCIPEDS PATENTS APPLIED FOR—VISIT OF NORTHERN CAPITALISTS TO THE SOUTHERN STATES.

Secretary Boutwell has issued an order directing that there shall be no exchange of securities to insure the public deposits in National Banks. This order is issued partly upon the grounds that the securities withdrawn are generally more valuable than those deposited, the security to the Government is practically weakened, and because of the additional risk incurred in handling and transporting the securities, besides the time of public officers occupied in attending to these exchanges.

During the week ending Monday there were received at the Patent Office 441 applications for patents, and 94 caveats filed. There were 833 patents ordered to issue on the 27th inst., which is a larger number than has ever before been issued by the office in one week. Five new velocipeds were also patented to-day, and two models of a new Bedford and Hyde Park, Mass., and Bridgeport, Conn. each one. Three Englishmen have also obtained patents for valuable inventions.

To-day a party of gentlemen, who intend to leave here for the purpose of visiting the South, had an interview with the President at the Executive Mansion. The party consists of Gen. Thos. L. Kane, ex-Gov. Ward of New Jersey, and Mr. Conger, Secretary of the U. S. Army, and Van Wyck of New-York. Col. J. W. Forney, William Prescott Smith, and others. President Grant received the party in the library, when Col. Forney stated that they were going to the South, and upon their previous to their departure for the South. Their visit was a purely disinterested one, entirely devoid of politics, to do what they could to promote good feeling between the two sections, and to assist in the development of the resources of the South. The President replied that he was very happy to hear that they intended to make the trip, and hoped it would be productive of the best results. Nothing would do more to properly reconstruct the South than white loyal emigration; and he had no doubt that Northern capital and Northern men would readily avail themselves of the superior inducements offered to them, and would be assisted of protection and a cordial welcome.

The prosecution in the Dyer Court-Martial case rested to-day, and the defense commenced with the presentation of documents and testimony. The court will probably to-morrow proceed to the residence of ex-Secretary Stanton, who is sick, and there take his testimony.

SENATOR CAMERON AND EX-GOV. CURTIN.  
The Washington correspondent of *The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin* telegraphs to that paper under date of April 17: "Senator Cameron authorizes an unqualified denial of the published statements about his opposition, in executive session, to the confirmation of ex-Gov. Curtin to the Russian mission. He made no opposition to a favorable report by the Foreign Relations Committee. When the subject came up in the Senate he did not, as stated, make a bitter speech against Mr. Curtin, but said that while Gov. Curtin was not recommended by the Representatives of his State, and in his own opinion, was not the choice of the Republican party of the State, yet, as he had been nominated by the President, he should not oppose his confirmation, nor vote against it. He made no remark upon Gov. Curtin's character as alleged. He did not call for a division, and none was taken, either standing or otherwise, and there is consequently no truth in the story that on the 16 or 17 Senators voted against Curtin's nomination."

THE BUTLER-KIMBERLY SUIT.  
BALTIMORE, Md., April 21.—In the case of Kimberly et al. vs. Butler in the United States Circuit Court, this forenoon, after the decision by Chief Justice Chase on plaintiff's demurrer to defendant's plea in abatement, argument was resumed upon defendant's demurrer to plaintiff's plea in replication to defendant's plea of limitation under the act of Congress, which involved the construction of the two sections passed for the protection of officers of the Government for acts committed, &c., during the late war. The argument was conducted by Mr. Brent for the plaintiff, and concluded by Mr. Cushing for the defendant. The Court, in deciding upon the question, has not yet reached a decision. The plaintiff's plea in replication demands that the statute of limitations, which he is authorized to plead under the seventh section of the act of Congress of 1863, be held to be a plea in replication, and that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held that the money was paid to the Provost-Marshal, and that the plaintiff's plea in replication demanding that the plea of limitation can be sustained, of which the Court is not satisfied. As the decision of the case does not depend upon the plea of limitation, the Court must consider whether upon plaintiff's declaration a case is made which can go to the jury. The Court held